

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

## **CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL AIRPORT-LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG#3 December 9, 2003**

Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati  
Facilitator: Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division  
Meeting summary prepared by PB Aviation

### **Attendees:**

1. Tom Popp, Blue Ash Airport
2. Brian Colpo, Hyde Park Neighborhood Council
3. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division
4. Ian Scott, East End Area Council
5. Darla Slagh, LUK ATCT
6. Bill Posey, FBO Rep.
7. Albert Peter, Anderson Township Trustee
8. Will Brown, Mt. Lookout Civic Club
9. Mel Martin, LNC
10. Jim Doepker, Ft. Thomas
11. Dwight Brewer
12. Patrick Kelly, Cin. Fire Dept.
13. Jim Miller, Cin. Fire Dept.
14. Krissi Barr, Business Community
15. Tom Ewing, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce
16. Doug Adams, Maremount
17. Tom Edwards, Flight Depot
18. Steve Fagel, City Law Department
19. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club
20. David Ross, California Community Council
21. Harold Blocher II, City of Highland Heights
22. Peter Bruemmer, AOPA
23. Patrick McDevitt, Linwood Community Council
24. JoAnna Brown, DOT&E TPUD
25. Reginald Victor, City of Cincinnati
26. Judy Zehren, Lunken Noise Council
27. Robert Roark, Lunken Noise Council
28. Deborah Conrad, KCAB-CVG
29. Scot Conover, Columbia Tusculum Community Council
30. John Frank, Cincinnati Board of Realtors
31. David Schlothauer, PB Aviation
32. Dan Dickten, Lunken Airport Administrator
33. David Rattenbury, LAAUC/Cincinnati Flight Training Center
34. Bob Vickrey, City of Cincinnati
35. Steve Crow, ATCT
36. Erik Nelson, Private
37. Bryan Snyder, Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission
38. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council
39. Don Rosemeyer, DOT&E, City Engineer
40. Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division
41. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation
42. Bart Gover, PB Aviation

Agenda Topic	Presenter	Discussion
<b>Greeting &amp; Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction of City staff</li> <li>• Introduction of consulting staff</li> <li>• Introduction of CTAG members</li> </ul>	Don Rosemeyer, DOT&E  Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bob Vickrey</li> <li>○ Cheri Rekow</li> <li>○ David Schlothauer</li> <li>○ Ed Cecil</li> <li>○ Bart Gover</li> </ul>
<b>Review of CTAG Meeting #2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting Summary</li> <li>• Review of Questions &amp; Answers</li> </ul>	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correction on aircraft operations observation period. Previously stated that observation period was 2 days.</li> <li>• 7 days of operations were provided by the ATCT, and then validated during 3 separate follow-up observation periods.</li> <li>• Best available data incorporated into the forecasts</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of Planning Process</li> <li>• Where in the process CTAG is currently</li> <li>• Explanation of how previous information ties into Facility Requirements</li> </ul>	David Schlothauer, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory</li> <li>• Forecasts</li> <li>• Demand Capacity/Facility Requirements</li> <li>• Alternatives</li> <li>• ALP Set</li> <li>• Environmental Review</li> <li>• Financial Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Working Session:</b> <b>Landside Requirements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FBO</li> <li>• Special Aviation Service Operations (SASO)</li> <li>• Corporate</li> <li>• Terminal</li> </ul>	Ed Cecil, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For preliminary land use planning purposes, the 2022 requirement for 63 additional based corporate jet aircraft was used as a benchmark for estimating the additional airport land area that would be required at Lunken Airport.</li> <li>• Approximately 38 acres of additional land lease area is needed and about 20 additional acres of infrastructure area is required. The additional lease area will support Corporate, FBO, and SASO land requirements for the design year 2022.</li> <li>• <u>12 acres of Corporate:</u> It is assumed that about one-half (30) of these future jets would be for corporate tenants and that 15 of these jets would be stored in the existing 8 lease areas. Assuming that each new corporate tenant would support 5 jets on a 4.0 acre lease area results in a requirement for 3 new lease areas totaling 12 acres.</li> <li>• <u>11 acres of FBO:</u> It is assumed that no new FBO's are required at LUK and the two FBO's will each have 10 additional corporate jet aircraft in 2022. This will require that the two</li> </ul>

		<p>FBO's be expanded by approximately 5.5 acres each for a total of approximately 12 additional acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>12 acres of SASO:</u> It is assumed that the SASO users will base the remaining 13 corporate jets and that three new 4.0-acre lease areas will be required to support these jet aircraft.</li> <li>• <u>12 acres of Support area:</u> New Infrastructure to support the Corporate, FBO, and SASO lease areas will include access roads, drainage, lease expansion areas, taxiway access, utility easements, etc.</li> <li>• <u>No additional land for terminal:</u> The 14 acre terminal area is considered adequate to support the long-range terminal and Airport administration land requirements.</li> <li>• <u>Options for expanding Lunken Airport about 50 acres to support Corporate, FBO, and SASO:</u></li> <li>• CTAG suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Acquire junkyard along Kellogg Ave. and move levee to south side of Kellogg.</li> <li>○ Relocate Taxiway "C" towards midfield and expand the existing FBO and SASO lease areas.</li> <li>○ Develop into midfield area.</li> <li>○ Develop portions of the 165-acre golf course.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bubble diagrams depicting each suggestion provided by CTAG were sketched and the negative and positive aspects of each alternative were discussed.</li> </ul>
<b>Working Session: Support Facilities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATCT</li> <li>• ARF</li> <li>• Maintenance Facilities</li> <li>• Roadway Access</li> <li>• Security</li> <li>• Bike trail</li> </ul>	Ed Cecil, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Support facilities required to achieve the landside facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ATCT relocation is required to see all runway ends if the midfield is developed.</li> <li>○ ARFF station location is adequate to support the design year requirements.</li> <li>○ Roadway Access must be provided for each facility development area (may require tunnel under Taxiway "C" if midfield developed).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Security requirements must protect against wildlife and people incursions.</li> <li>○ Options for reconfiguring the bike trail away from the terminal curb front are under study by the City.</li> <li>○ Area for the relocation of midfield surface water drainage will be required if taxiways or hangars are located in the midfield.</li> </ul>
<b>Working Session:</b> <b>Airside Facilities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxiways</li> <li>• Runways</li> <li>• Aprons</li> <li>• NAVAIDS</li> <li>• Critical Aircraft</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Airside Facility requirements options:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Taxiway "C" relocated towards midfield.</li> <li>○ Parallel Taxiway for R/W 3R/21L.</li> <li>○ 900ft. R/W Extension is required to meet required critical aircraft field length. Short term (10 years) critical aircraft is the G-V (90,900 lbs. MTOW), and the long term (20 years) Boeing BBJ (171,000 lbs MTOW). Runway extension options include extension to 3R, 21L, or a combination.</li> <li>○ CAT I approach must be moved to accommodate R/W extension options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Discussion of FAA's designated Safety Areas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runway Protection Zone (RPZ)</li> <li>• Runway Safety Area (RSA)</li> <li>• Part 77 Surfaces</li> </ul>	Ed Cecil, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of safety areas and the changes needed to increase safety at the Airport.</li> <li>• <u>RPZ</u>: trapezoidal shaped area located at runway ends designed for emergency aircraft overrun and/or overshoot. Size of RPZ contingent on R/W classification</li> <li>• <u>RSA</u>: area surrounding all sides of R/W designed to be clear of all non-frangible objects in order to allow for safe aircraft operations.</li> <li>• <u>Part 77 surfaces</u> consist of 5 different airspace classifications designed to protect against any fixed objects located within the approach &amp; departure areas of an airport.</li> </ul>

## Cincinnati Municipal Airport-Lunken Field

### CTAG # 3

#### Questions & Comments

PB Aviation, December 10, 2003

1. Will funding be available to build the improvements suggested for the Airport by the time the activity level requires it?

Answer: The necessary scheduled funding for capital improvement projects will be addressed in the financial plan chapter of the Master Plan Update. In the financial plan options for funding capital projects and airport operations costs will be analyzed. Typical funding sources for Lunken Airport include: City airport operating funds, FAA grants, fuel flowage fees, airport tenant lease revenues and other non aviation revenue sources such as restaurants and office parks. Each of these sources will be used to develop and operate facilities, as they are needed. The master plan only identifies the point in time that the projected aviation activity level justifies the need for a capital development project and the estimated capital cost for each project. The availability of federal, city or private funds for each justified project is not analyzed in the financial plan.

2. What types of revenue can be generated on the Airport?

See answer number 1.

3. Will hush houses be recommended in the Master Plan?

Answer: Hush houses are noise mitigation measures designed to reduce the noise produced during engine run-ups that are typically conducted during aircraft maintenance checks. The current Lunken Part 150 study will make recommendations regarding mitigation measures designed to reduce noise. The use of hush houses, aircraft enclosures or noise berms will be evaluated in the Alternatives Analysis Chapter 4.0.

4. In naming both the Gulfstream 5 (G-V) and Boeing Business Jet (BBJ) as the design year critical aircraft for the 20-year planning period, why weren't newer corporate aircraft being used instead of older corporate aircraft?

Answer: In a survey issued to the all airport tenants, results showed that for the next 20 years, the G-V and BBJ would likely be the largest corporate aircraft types that would use Lunken Airport on a regular basis. Given these survey results as well as a review of aviation industry trade publications, it was determined that most potential new corporate jet aircraft types would have less range and weight than the G-V. If other aircraft larger than the BBJ operate from Lunken Airport in the future, the Master Plan will likely be updated to assess the facility requirements needed for these aircraft types.

5. How many of the required 250 operations actually require a 7000 ft. R/W length?

Answer: The 250 total annual departures by the critical design aircraft is one suggested measure presented by the FAA for determining when a runway should be upgraded. Other justifications include the acquisition of an aircraft by an airport tenant that requires a runway length that will support the aircraft at a maximum take off weight during above standard day conditions. The actual need for the 7,000 ft. runway may only be needed several times during the summer months.

6. Why does the Airport need an R/W extension if the critical aircraft can still operate to and from the Airport on the existing runway length?

Answer: In order for the aircraft to operate at maximum takeoff weight in above standard day conditions, the G-V and BBJ needs 7,000 ft. to operate safely. During standard day conditions, the aircraft may be able to takeoff on less than 7,000 ft. but may have to land at another airport in order to take on extra fuel needed to complete the intended trip. The costs associated with a less than adequate R/W length make it impractical for the aircraft operator to base their aircraft at an airport, which limits the capable range of their aircraft.

**COMMENTS:**

1. Any solution to Airport space, which builds in mid-field area will, at a minimum curtail, at worst stop, airship, helicopter training and banner tow business. I have no idea what percentage of total operations these 3 categories amount to and they appear to be bi-modal - none or a lot - at any point in time. It is easy to understand why they might have got missed in a 7-day survey.

Response: If development were to be implemented into the midfield area, sufficient space would be maintained in order to continue all banner towing, helicopter training and airship staging currently permitted under Airport regulations. Alternatives depicting potential development schemes will be developed in Chapter 4.0.

2. In previous discussions regarding "trigger points" and their importance to decision making with respect to the Airport, City Council has been unresponsive in past efforts to take action when "trigger points" have occurred.

Response: Comment is noted. City administration will continue to advise City Council and provide information, requesting Council action as needed.

3. It's up to the City to determine the overall R/W length. Using the recommendations from the consultant and the comments from the CTAG, the City will make a decision based on their ability to meet the required facilities.

Response: Using input from the consultants and the CTAG, the City will review a potential R/W extension based on the best available information and the overall goals and objectives for the Airport's future.

**Next Meeting**

**January 20, 2004  
H.C. Nutting Ctr.  
5:00pm**